12:Murphy E-5 (1952-1953) 1960
SQ13 Mundurucu SQ13



the right to exploit the trees reached by the path; no concept of land or territorial private property is implied. Also, a man's right to a rubber avenue is recognized as valid and absolute only as long as he works it. If he abandons it, it may be worked by another after the former owner's permission is asked. If the owner of a rubber avenue dies, it passes to a son or son-in-law, who may either work it or dispose of it. Rubber avenues are not bought and sold by the Munduruc\u00fa and are not in themselves subject to commercial transaction. But despite this, they form the only type of natural resource subject to private ownership in this society. This fact gains increasing social importance in direct ratio to the dependence of the Munduruc\u00fa on the returns of rubber production. As this dependence increases, so does its individualizing effect on the society.

Almost all Munduruc\u00fa tap rubber on land reserved by the government for their use. The traders do not have any right of allocation of these rubber avenues, as they do in the areas under their control. Technically, the Indian is an independent producer, working on his own property as a free laborer, and selling on the market. But the same system of exclusive patronage and debt obligation that prevails in the Amazon has been extended to the native population, and the market is not an open one. That the Indian cannot be dispossessed from his rubber avenue, and that he does not rely on the trader for food give him somewhat more independence than the Brazilian rubber tapper, however.

Other, traditional bonds, reinforce the patron-client relationship. The tie is sometimes conceived of as between the trader and the leader of a group of Indians, as in the instance of the chief of Cabruá, who trades on behalf of a bloc of villagers. The patron thus counts on the loyalty of these followers to their chief. In other cases, the bond is